

2 DEC 1979 Chrono-Deu

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director, Central Reference

SUBJECT : Draft Executive Development Outline

Harry:

I concur with most of the points contained in the draft NFAC response to the draft Executive Development Outline (EDO). I think they capture the concerns we need to raise. Rather than reiterate them, I offer the following comments and recommendations.

- To have the desired impact, the NFAC response should have a less negative tone to it. This is particularly true for the buckslip! Some program similar to the EDO is going to be formed, and I think the NFAC comments will be better received if we offer to the EDO creators a useful and logical alternative to their proposed program.
- I suggest that the NFAC response be organized differently than it is. The present draft has three major parts (major difficulties, specific comments, recommendations) and we consequently discuss certain concerns three times. Perhaps we ought to only have two sections to the response: the first dealing with NFAC reaction to the major points of the draft EDO, and the second outlining an alternative program.
- The theme of the NFAC response should center on the similarities of the EDO to the PDP, both in terms of objectives and scope. The present NFAC draft makes this point, but I think it needs to be strengthened. The mention of the unsuccessful history of 5-year plans is a good point, but I think the NFAC argument on this point could be strengthened by showing how individual development programs can readily be accommodated in the PDP.
- A number of points in the EDO need to be clarified. Some, such as the number and nature of rotational assignments and the relationship of executive assignments to the vacancy notice system, are addressed in the NFAC draft. Other foggy points are:
 - Exactly what types of managers are we trying to develop? Are we saying that any SIS non-specialist can fill any SIS position? If not, exactly what is the program trying to achieve? In the draft NFAC comments mention that not every librarian will want to become involved in para-military operations. We need to raise the other point that not every librarian has the inherent qualities to make a good para-military officer. Don't force fit.

- What are the criteria for determining who is to reach executive level, and once there, move on to additional responsibility. Is it the CER or something in addition?
- I suggest the issue concerning who (the DCI/DDCI or Directorate Head) selects people for office level positions be strengthened. This is a critical point and it seems to get less attention than it deserves.
- There are several points in the draft NFAC response with which I do not agree.
 - On Page 3, I disagree with the idea that the GS-13 level is too early to make a career track decision. I also disagree with the manner in which we raise the concern over the impact of this program on the quality of intelligence. I suggest that rather than raise this concern as being competitive with the quality of intelligence, we should state that this program must be an integral part of present efforts to improve the quality of intelligence.
 - There seems to be a lot of attention paid to the SIS level 3. I think this should be deemphasized.

Please give me a call if you would like further clarification or elaboration on any of these comments.

25X1



25X1

Approved For Release 2004/01/28 : CIA-RDP82T00285R000200120006-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2004/01/28 : CIA-RDP82T00285R000200120006-5